REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully submits this Amendment And Request For Reconsideration in response to the Office Action of 05 December 2008.

In the present Amendment, the Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 12, and 15, and new claims 32-34 have been added; no claims have been canceled. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the claims as revised based on the reasons presented herein.

In the Office Action mailed on 05 December 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jin (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0084888A1). In addition, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 9, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jin in view of Minborg (U.S. Patent No. 6,977,909). In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejections and submits that all pending claims 1-22 as revised and new claims 32-34 are allowable over the prior art for at least the following reasons.

In order for claims to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a), the prior art in combination must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. In the present case, the relied upon art of the Examiner fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims.

In particular, the relied upon art fails to teach or suggest the acts of "reading," "storing," and "repeating" which are performed *"automatically"* and *"without prompting"* ... "in response to detecting a trigger signal" for such user-specific information items as claimed in claims 1-22.

For discussion, the Applicant provides amended method claim 1 below. Method claim 1 recites:

> 1. A method performed by a mobile station for automatically grouping user-specific information items, each user-specific information item being for use in identifying or contacting a user of the mobile station, the method comprising the acts of:
> detecting, at the mobile station, a trigger signal;
> in response to detecting the trigger signal, automatically grouping the user-specific information items by performing the following acts without prompting for user entry or selection of any of the user-specific information items at a user interface of the mobile station:
>> reading, from a first file of the mobile station, a first user-specific information item for identifying or contacting the user;
>> storing the first user-specific information item in a user information file or a message of the mobile station; and
>> repeating the acts of reading, from a second file of the mobile station, the at least second user-specific information item, and storing, in the user information file or the message, the at least a second user-specific information item, so that the first and the second user-specific information items are grouped together as user information in the user information file or the message.

As apparent, the recited acts of "reading," "storing,", and "repeating" are *indented* to the right of the "automatically grouping" and "without prompting" recitations – all of which are performed "in response to detecting the trigger signal." Put another way, the

claims are formatted and otherwise fashioned so that the acts of "reading," "storing," and "repeating" *structurally* fall under the purview of the single triggering act.

Thus, proper interpretation thus requires that the acts of "reading" and "storing" of a first user-specific information item, as well as the acts of "reading" and "storing" again (i.e. the repeating act) of a second user-specific information item, are performed in response to detecting the *single* trigger signal in the automatic grouping.

Notably, the actions of "reading" and "storing", and "reading" and "storing" again (i.e. the repeating act), are performed *without prompting for user entry or selection of any of the user-specific information items*. These = limitations are = supported in the present application, e.g. in relation to the description of FIG. 5, where the *"automatic"* grouping is described to be performed by the *processor* of the mobile station, without *user intervention or prompting* after detection of the trigger signal.

In the Jin reference, on the other hand, it is an important objective that the user be prompted for user entry or selection of the user-specific information items. As apparent from FIGs. 4A-4E of Jin and its description, for example, the prior art teachings require the user to manually enter the multiple user information items through an application. This is not what is claimed and generally illustrates the differences between the relied upon art and that claimed. Jin actually teaches the opposite of that which is claimed.

According to the present techniques, methods and apparatus for use in *automatically* grouping user-specific information items are provided in a mobile station. The mobile station has a processor, a user interface and memory coupled to the processor. The processor is adapted to automatically group user-specific information items in response to detecting a trigger signal. The automatic grouping of user-specific

information items involves the following acts which are performed without prompting for user entry or selection of any of the user-specific information items at a user interface of the mobile station. A first user-specific information item for identifying or contacting the user is read from a first file of the mobile station, and the first user-specific information item is stored in a central user information file or a message of the mobile station. The acts of reading and storing are then *repeated* for at least a second user-specific information item for identifying or contacting the user, so that the first and the second user-specific information items are grouped together as user information in the central user information file or the message of the mobile station.

As the relied upon art of the Examiner fails to teach or suggest an automatic grouping of user-specific information items in response to detecting a trigger signal, without prompting for user entry or selection of any one of the items, the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Further, with respect to new claims 32-34, as well as dependent claims 9 and 19, there is no adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Minborg with the teachings of Jin as the Examiner proposes. For one, the teachings of Minborg relate to a time expiring during a download of a data object for cancellation of the download, which relates nothing to Jin which pertains to the entry of information in an SMS message. As apparent, one ordinarily skilled in the art would not have looked to the specific teachings of object download cancellation of Minborg to solve any problem or deficiency of Jin.

Secondly, to modify the teachings of Jin in accordance with the Examiner's proposal would be non-sensical. There would not have been any adequate reason why one ordinarily skilled in the art would have desired an SMS message to be transmitted in response to an expiration of a timer, as opposed to the ordinary common scenario

where the user enters and sends an SMS message to the party of his/her choice at the time of his/her choice.

Other reasons for allowability of both the independent and dependent claims are apparent to those skilled in the art, but are not detailed herein due to the already-indicated reasons for allowability.

Based on the reasons presented herein, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of pending claims 1-22 as amended. The Applicants submit that the application as amended is in a condition suitable for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Oskorep/

JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

Date: 05 March 2009

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 USA
Telephone: (312) 222-1860   Fax: (312) 475-1850